REMARKS

Claims 1-10, and 12-22 remain pending in the application. Claim 2 is objected to and

claims 1-22 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claims 2, 12, 13, and 15 have been amended

and claim 11 has been canceled. The Office Action of January 30, 2003 has been carefully

reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. No new matter has been introduced into the

application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Priority

As suggested by the Examiner, the first page of the application has been updated to

identify the provisional application serial number.

Drawings

Figure 1 was objected to because the figure did not include a prior art legend and

included reference numeral errors. The attached proposed drawing correction inserts a prior art

legend to figure 1 and elements the redundant reference characters. Moreover, the paragraph

beginning on page 5, line 17 has been amended to describe bus 145.

Objections to Specification and Claim

The specification was objected to as containing minor informalities. The specification

has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Claim 2 was objected to and has

also been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration of these

objections is requested.

Rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6 and 9-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S.

Patent No. 6,446,110 to Lection, et al. ("Lection"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the

rejection.

Claim 1 is drawn to a method of exchanging data and includes the feature of "generating

a first software envelope containing the data file." The present specification describes the

"software envelope" feature, for example, on page 7, lines 12-17 as follows:

> In this patent the term "envelope" refers to information that defines a delivery
> convention such as one or more of routing information, return routing information
> and state management information, much in the same way that a postal system
> envelope defines a convention where the routing and delivery can be
> accomplished independent of the final purpose, processing disposition, and
> information of the contents of the envelope.

Figure 3 also illustrates one embodiment of the claimed software envelope. Data is placed

between <body> tags 310 within the software envelope. Figure 6 illustrates an embodiment in

which the data between <body> tags 310 is marked up with a markup language.

Lection discloses a method of transferring data streams across a distributed data

processing system. The data streams correspond to screen images and allow a client computer

running an emulator application to reproduce the screen image generated by a host computer. In

some of the disclosed embodiments, the data stream is parsed and tagged into an XML

datastream. In contrast to what is claimed, Lection fails to teach or suggest "generating a first

software envelope containing the data file." At most, Lection teaches marking up a datastream with XML. For example, in column 5, lines 57-64, Lection teaches "using a markup language to markup screen data by contents, attributes, and interactions" and in column 2, lines 28-30 Lection discloses that "[t]he present invention provides methods and apparatus for representing host datastream screen image information using markup languages."

On page 4, the Office Action asserts that the datastream disclosed in Lection is a software envelope. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. As described above, the present specification describes a software envelope as being different than a marked up data file or datastream. A exemplary marked up data file is illustrated in Figure 6 of the application. The marked up data file is contained within a software envelope and is not the same as a software envelope.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-6 and 9-10 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. The dependent claims also contain features not shown in Lection. Claim 2, for example, includes the feature of "automatically generating a second software envelope from the information in the first software envelope." The Action alleges that this feature is shown in Lection column 6, lines 49-50 and element 416 of Fig. 4. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited sections of Lection relate to datastreams. As described above, the claimed software envelopes are not the same as datastreams.

Claim 12 has been rewritten in independent form and thus has not been changed in scope since it's filing. In particular, claim 12 includes the feature of "a data field containing manifest

information corresponding to the information contained in the data file data field." The present

specification describes "manifest information," for example, on page 10, lines 10-20. Manifest

information is also illustrated in figure 5 of the application. As described in the application,

manifest information may include the name of a document, description of a document, name of

attachments, description of attachments and identification of the type of attachment.

The Action alleges that the feature of "a data field containing manifest information

corresponding to the information contained in the data file data field" is found in column 9, lines

7-9 of Lection. In column 9, lines 6-9, Lection states that "[a] DTD is a grammar that describes

what tags and attributes are valid in an XML document or datastream that refers to the DTD and

in what context the tags and attributes are valid." This section of Lection merely relates to the

format of an XML document or datastream and does not teach or suggest including "a data field

containing manifest information corresponding to the information contained in the data file data

field," as now claimed in claim 11. Lection never mentions manifest information or using a data

field that contains manifest information.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 12 is in

condition for allowance. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Dependent claims 13-15 depend from

independent claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 12.

Independent claims 16 and 20 includes the features of "generating a software envelope

containing the data file," and "receiving a software envelope containing a data file," respectively.

As described above, Lection fails to or suggest generating or using the claimed "software

envelope." For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 16 and 20

13

are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 17-19 and 21-22, which ultimately depend from independent claims 16 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Lection. Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this ground of rejection for the reasons given above.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, and the Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with Applicant's representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to call Applicant's representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/30/03   By: _____
                                               William J. Adler
                                               Registration No. 51,393

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
10 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7407
(312) 463-5000